

Best Available Copy



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS,
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/002,648 01/05/98 HORNE

D 042390.P5113

EXAMINER

WM02/1128

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR AND ZAFMAN
7TH FLOOR
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES CA 90025

GHEBRETINSAE, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2631

DATE MAILED:

11/28/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action

Application No.
09/002,648

Applicant(s)

HORNE

Examiner
TEMESGHEN GHEBRETINSAE

Group Art Unit
2631



THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

a) ☒ expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on _____ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Nov 9, 2000 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

☐ The proposed amendment(s):

☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.

☐ will not be entered because:

☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).

☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).

☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-16, 19-24 as claimed now are anticipated and obvious over Rosen. (see attached paper)

☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: 4, 7, 17, and 18

Claims rejected: 1-3, 5, 6, 8-16, and 19-24

☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Other

TEMESGHEN GHEBRETINSAE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2631

Art Unit: 27342631

Response to Arguments

Applicant arguments is not clear it seems to imply that a) the encoded signal corresponds to the information to be sent i.e., "**information 213**" = "**information 214**". b) the **logical number or the numeric value** of the information corresponds to the **encoded signal**. However as claimed the word "**correspond**" is so vague that the claims (1-3, 5-6,8-16,19-24) as claimed now read on Rosen claimed invention.(see Rosen col. 1, lines 23-43)


TEMESGHEN GHEBRETINSAE
PRIMARY EXAMINER